



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE BABYLONIAN RELATIVE PRONOUN

BY S. LANGDON  
Oxford

The literature concerning the relative pronoun šā is already extensive and a new discussion of this particle can be justified only by a serious attempt to clear up certain obscurities which still remain. Kraetzschmar<sup>1</sup> twenty-four years ago showed that šā is obviously connected with the proto-Semitic demonstrative root θā which appears in Arabic θa m m a, "there," Hebrew ša m m a, Syr. ta m m a.<sup>2</sup> It is true that this demonstrative element has left few traces of itself in Semitic languages. In Hebrew it survives only as the relative ך, -ך, -ך and in Phoenician as 𐤊𐤍 (e š š e<sup>3</sup>). 𐤊, šā (with originally long vowel) on the analogy of other relative pronouns, Syr. d<sup>e</sup> = dī, Arabic dī, Ethiopic zā = zā, Arabic dā, Hebrew ד, Arabic dī, 𐤌 = 𐤌, Arabic dā, must have been originally a demonstrative pronoun in Babylonian. This was of course discovered long ago and now forms one of the statements regarding šā in the lexicons and grammars.<sup>4</sup> This demonstrative force appears in the sense "he of," "he who is a man of," and corresponds precisely to the similar use of Arabic dū, dī, dā, masculine singular nominative, genitive, and accusative. In other words the Arabic demonstrative pronoun dā masculine, dī feminine is here declined as a triptote

<sup>1</sup> *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, I, 381.

<sup>2</sup> See also Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, I, §108b.

<sup>3</sup> This form has been explained as a formation from šā by means of a prosthetic 'ā 𐤊 (so Kraetzschmar, *op. cit.*, who compares the conjunctive adverbs kī and akī, "as"). But prosthetic 'a is short, which does not explain the doubling of 𐤊 in Phoenician. Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 20, following König, supposes the form to be strengthened by the demonstrative element, 'ā, 𐤊, seen according to König in 𐤊𐤍 (König and Cooke claim to find this demonstrative in 𐤊𐤍𐤍 which seems to me doubtful), but 𐤊 is tone-long here, 𐤊 arising from an earlier āzē, still found in Tigrē, and reappears in the construct 𐤊𐤍 ('a z a i). 𐤊𐤍 is rather another example of the demonstrative pronoun strengthened by the demonstrative element 𐤌 as in Arabic dā, hādā, Syriac hādē, Talmud hādēn, hādī. The original would be hāšā > 'āšā > āššā > ašše. The change from 𐤌 to 𐤊 is common enough to require no elucidation.

<sup>4</sup> See Delitzsch, *Handwörterbuch*, p. 630, and the same scholar's *Assyrische Grammatik*, § 84; Meissner, *Assyrische Grammatik*, §§ 31 f.; Muss-Arnolt, *Concise Dictionary*, p. 992.

and given the sense "man of." We may suppose on this analogy that proto-Semitic had a similar form  $\theta\bar{u}$ ,  $\theta\bar{i}$ ,  $\theta\bar{a}$  which became in Babylonian  $\check{s}\bar{u}$ ,  $\check{s}\bar{i}$ ,  $\check{s}\bar{a}$ , or a fully declined demonstrative pronoun with the sense "man of," "one of." We may perhaps assume a feminine corresponding to the Arabic  $\check{d}\bar{a}t\bar{u}$ , i.e.,  $\check{s}\bar{a}t\bar{u}$  and fully declined  $\check{s}\bar{a}t\bar{u}$ ,  $\check{s}\bar{a}t\bar{i}$ ,  $\check{s}\bar{a}t\bar{a}$ . The Arabic plurals  $\check{d}a\check{u}\bar{u}$  (cstr. for  $\check{d}a\check{u}\bar{u}na$ ),  $\check{d}a\check{u}\bar{i}$  (cstr. for  $\check{d}a\check{u}\bar{i}na$ ),  $\check{d}a\check{u}\bar{a}t\bar{u}$ ,  $\check{d}a\check{u}\bar{a}t\bar{i}$  prove that the demonstrative pronoun  $\check{d}\bar{a}$  (the masculine form) is used as the base of the system.

If we may suppose with Meissner<sup>1</sup> and Ungnad<sup>2</sup> that  $\check{s}\bar{a}$ , shortened regularly to  $\check{s}\check{a}$  in Babylonian,<sup>3</sup> is really the accusative singular, then we must follow these scholars and regard the relative  $\check{s}\bar{u}$ , which has survived in a few examples, as the nominative singular. The genitive  $\check{s}\bar{i}$ ,  $\check{s}i$  at any rate has wholly disappeared. Rare forms  $\check{s}\check{u}t$  and  $\check{s}\bar{a}t$  also occur. Ungnad regards  $\check{s}\check{u}t$  as a plural,<sup>4</sup> and does not mention  $\check{s}\bar{a}t$  at all. Meissner and Delitzsch in their grammars mention neither  $\check{s}\check{u}t$  nor  $\check{s}\bar{a}t$ . Ungnad defends the accusative form of  $\check{s}\bar{a}$  on the ground that when this relative pronoun is in the accusative it does not require a supplementary suffixed pronoun to explain it, since it is already in the accusative. This statement is erroneous.<sup>5</sup> Note, for example,  $\check{s}ar\ Elam\ ti\ \check{s}\bar{a}\ la\ agr\check{u}-\check{s}u$ , "The king of Elam whom I hated not."<sup>6</sup> There is, indeed, a tendency in Babylonian as in Arabic<sup>7</sup> and Hebrew<sup>8</sup> to omit the supplementary pronominal suffix when the relative is in the accusative.<sup>9</sup> Babylonian, like all other Semitic languages, probably derived this relative pronoun directly from a demonstrative pronoun.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> *Babylonisch-assyrische Grammatik*, §§ 16b, 13e.

<sup>3</sup> But in the Amarna Letters the relative is frequently long;  $\check{s}\bar{a}-a\ la-a\ i-lak\ ana\ arki\ \check{s}arri\ b\bar{e}li-ja$ , "who walks not after the king my lord," Winckler, *KB*, V, No. 150, 45.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, § 13e.

<sup>5</sup> Ranke, *Personal Names*, p. 245, n. 9, also adhered to the old view that  $\check{s}\bar{a}$  is an accusative of the nominative  $\check{s}\bar{u}$ , and that  $\check{s}\bar{a}t$  is a feminine form. Ranke explains  $\check{s}\check{u}t$  as a plural, probably thinking of the adjectival plural  $-u\bar{t}i$ .

<sup>6</sup> K. 2867, 15, in S. A. Smith, *Ashurbanipal*, Part 2, No. 1.

<sup>7</sup> See Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, 323A.

<sup>8</sup> Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, § 138b.

<sup>9</sup> See Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, § 190.

Hebrew employed  $\text{אִי}$  or  $\text{אִי}$  (for  $\text{אִי}$  by obscuring  $\bar{a} > \bar{o}$ ), forms derived from the masculine and feminine of the demonstrative. The Aramaic relative  $\text{אִי}$  is also the same word as  $\text{אִי}$  in the masculine demonstrative  $d\bar{e}k = di + k$ . And Syriac  $d^o$  is an abbreviated form of an earlier  $d\bar{i}$  used in Syriac as the feminine demonstrative. So also Ethiopic relative  $z\check{a}$  is the same word as  $z\bar{a}$ , feminine singular. As Ethiopic chose of its two forms  $z\bar{a}$  and  $z\check{e}$  the feminine  $z\bar{a}$  for its relative pronoun, so Babylonian may have chosen from a lost pronoun  $\check{s}\bar{a}$  and  $\check{s}e^1$  the form  $\check{s}\bar{a}$ . Hebrew has retained both as  $\text{וְ}$  and  $\text{וְ}$ , hence it is obvious that we have here no accusative in  $\check{s}\bar{a}$  but the simple demonstrative pronoun. I believe that Hebrew, Ethiopic, and Babylonian had the following demonstrative systems, in the singular. The plural need not concern us here, for the relative in each language is not inflected for number and is obtained from the singular demonstrative.

	Masculine	Feminine	Relative
Ethiopic . . . . .	$z\check{e}$ (originally $z\bar{i}$ )	$z\bar{a}$	$z\check{a}$
Hebrew . . . . .	$z\check{e}$ " "	$z\bar{o}$ (for $z\bar{a}$ )	$z\check{e}$ and $z\bar{o}$
(also)			
Hebrew . . . . .	$\check{s}\check{e}$ (originally $\check{s}\bar{i}$ )	$\check{s}\bar{a}$	$\check{s}\check{e}$ and $\check{s}\bar{a}$
Babylonian . . . . .	$\check{s}\check{e}$ " "	$\check{s}\bar{a}^2$	$\check{s}\bar{a}$

In the original system there was no case inflection whatsoever.<sup>3</sup> In these languages there arose a tendency to attach the emphatic element  $t$  to these forms,  $t\bar{a}$  for masculine and  $t\bar{i}$  for the feminine, elements which appear in  $ant\check{a}$ , "thou," masculine,  $ant\bar{i}$ , "thou," feminine (Ethiopic),  $att\bar{a}$ ,  $att\bar{i}$  [ $>at$ ] (Hebrew),  $att\bar{a}$ ,  $att\bar{i}$  (Babylonian). But when this emphatic element was added to the third person Semitic languages tended to employ  $t\bar{u}$ <sup>4</sup> for  $t\bar{a}$  in the masculine. Thus they obtained the suffixes  $-t\bar{u}$   $-t\bar{i}$ . Their vowels were both long, as the Ethiopic doubly strengthened forms  $zent\bar{u}$

<sup>1</sup> It is impossible to say whether Babylonian regarded the form in  $\bar{a}$  as masculine with Arabic, or feminine with Hebrew, Ethiopic, and biblical Aramaic.

<sup>2</sup> This demonstrative pronoun, based upon proto-Semitic  $\theta\bar{a}$ , was recognized by the Babylonian grammarians, for they explain the Sumerian demonstrative  $\bar{u}r$  by  $\check{s}u-u$ ,  $\check{s}a-a$  and  $\check{s}u-a-t\bar{i}$ , *CT*, 12, 21, 93040 Rev. 26-28. See *Sumerian Grammar*, p. 109, n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> All these languages inverted the original (Arabic) system which employed the  $\bar{a}$  forms for the masculine,  $\bar{i}$  forms for the feminine.

<sup>4</sup> The change  $t\bar{a} > t\bar{u}$  was probably brought about by analogy with the personal pronoun  $h\bar{u}$ ,  $\check{s}\bar{u}$ .

(masculine singular), *el ū n t ū* (masculine plural) prove. With this suffix the above system should appear in its primitive form as follows:

	Masculine	Feminine
Ethiopic.....	<i>zīt ū *</i> , <i>zēt ū *</i>	<i>zā t ī</i>
Hebrew.....	<i>zīt ū *</i> , <i>zēt ū *</i>	<i>zā t ī</i>
(also)		
Hebrew.....	<i>šīt ū *</i> , <i>šēt ū *</i>	<i>šā t ī *</i>
Babylonian....	<i>šīt ū *</i> , <i>šēt ū *</i>	<i>šā t ī *</i>

Of this system all the forms starred have disappeared. The Hebrew *zā t ī* became *zāt*, *zā th > zō th*, dropping the long vowel *ī*. Babylonian in the same way retains *šā t ī > šāt*, which appears only as a relative pronoun; *zā t ī* in Ethiopic is regular.

A tendency to decline the demonstrative pronoun in Ethiopic appears for the accusative in those forms which in the original system did not end in *ā* or *ā*; so for *zē* a hybrid accusative *zā*; for *zā t ī* a hybrid accusative *zātā*. So also the accusative of *zent ū*<sup>1</sup> appears as *zantā*, of *el ū n t ū* as *el ū n ta*. But these inflected forms do not belong to the original system. The same emphatic *t ū*, *t ī*, shortened to *t ũ*, *t ĩ*, forms a vital factor in the formation of the demonstrative system in Babylonian; here all of the demonstrative roots discussed above, with the exception of *šā* (which was no longer employed as a demonstrative), disappeared. In their place this language employs the personal pronoun as a demonstrative.

	Singular	Plural
Masculine.....	<i>š ū</i>	<i>š ū n ū</i>
Feminine.....	<i>š ī</i>	<i>š ī n ā</i>
With emphatic <i>tu</i> , <i>ti</i>		
	Singular	Plural
Masculine.....	<i>š ū t ū</i>	<i>š ū n ū tu *</i> <i>š ū n ū ti</i> <sup>2</sup>
Feminine.....	<i>š ī t ī</i>	<i>š ā n ā ti</i>

These forms are not declinable.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The feminine *zā n t ī \** was lost, probably because the language already had a strengthened form *zā t ī*.

<sup>2</sup> The change *tu > ti* is probably another example of the dissimilation of vowels to avoid the three vowel sounds *ū-ū-u*.

<sup>3</sup> Meissner's statement that *šua* is an oblique (genitive-accusative) form of *š ū* (*Grammatik*, p. 17c) is certainly incorrect.

These particles suffixed to the proto-Semitic suffixes šu'a\* šī'a\*<sup>1</sup> produce the demonstrative system:<sup>2</sup>

	Singular	Plural
Masculine.....	šu ā tu	šu ā tu nu
Feminine.....	ši ā ti	ši ā ti na *, šā ti na

The personal pronoun h ū, š ū appears to have influenced the demonstrative pronoun third masculine singular in Hebrew and Babylonian. By logical analogy both languages appear to have devised the following system:

	Personal	Demonstrative	Relative
Hebrew.....	h ū	(z ě) z ū *	z ū
Babylonian.....	š ū <sup>3</sup>	(š ě) š ū *	š ū
Arabic.....	h ū	đ ī, đ ū <sup>3</sup>	đ u <sup>4</sup>

z ū and š ū, which appear sporadically as relative pronouns, are not nominative cases but masculine forms of the demonstrative. Both languages probably added the masculine emphatic particle t ū, tu to these forms, producing z ū t ū \*, š ū t ū \*; only Babylonian has preserved this representative of a once complete system where š ū t frequently appears as the relative. It, like š ā t, is an emphatic singular, and not a plural. These forms, š ā (š ā), š ā t, š ū, š ū t, are, therefore, old demonstrative pronouns, and for the sake of completeness I give examples of each.

#### A. š ā, š ā

1. Demonstrative. See above, p. 273, n. 2.
2. "He of," "man of"; or, in a neuter sense, "thing of." (a) š a e ṭ i m m i, "man of ghosts," necromancer; (b) š a m a ḥ r i, "the of former (time)," former time; š a a k a l i m, "the of eating," something to eat; š a k u n n i p a r š i-š u n u, "the fixing of their decrees," VAB, IV, 66, 6. This construction

<sup>1</sup> Assimilated forms of hu'a\* masculine, šī'a\* feminine. See Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 303γ.

<sup>2</sup> Variant forms are here passed over. These demonstratives were originally employed only in the oblique cases, in apposition or to emphasize a pronominal suffix. They are necessarily oblique, since they are really emphatic forms of pronominal suffixes. See Ungnad, *Grammatik*, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> A demonstrative only in the sense, "man of"; see above. Declined as a noun by analogy with adjectives.

<sup>4</sup> Only in dialects. See Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 325; Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, p. 272, Rem. e.

may be governed by a preposition. lu-tur a-na ša šu-uḥ-ri-ia-a-ma, "I will return to the state of my youth," Dhorme, *Choix de textes*, 312, 299; ina ša šêri, "in the morning," V R. 10, 71; cf. ina šāt mûši. *Passim*, in the expression for "more than": eli ša maḥrim, "more than formerly," VAB, IV, 74, 41. In proper names Ša-<sup>11u</sup>Amurrim, "She of <sup>11u</sup>Ammuru," name of a woman, Th. Dangin, *Lettres et contrats*, 44; Ša-ili-šu, "She of his god," *ibid.*, also name of a woman, but name of a man, "He of his god," Ranke, *Personal Names*, p. 141; Ša-Aja, "He of Aja," *ibid.*; Ša-<sup>11at</sup>Išḫara, "He of Išḫara," *ibid.*, p. 142. Note that ša has no preference for gender as a relative. The whole is frequently regarded as a compound and preceded by the determinative a melu to denote a profession: (a mel) ša bit-ḥallati, "the cavalry officer." Here belongs the grammatical use of ša in the sense of "of"; alāku ša ma'a dûtî, "to go-the-of many," Syl. C 311; alāku ša elippi, "to go-the-of a ship," V R. 16, d 73; ḥabātum ša šalāli, "to seize-the-of to plunder," II, 26 g 11.

3. Replaces construct relation between two nouns, in the sense of both subjective and objective genitive. In reality ša, as an indeclinable demonstrative, takes upon itself the construct relation of the former noun, by which means the declension of this noun may then be retained. rubū šîru . . . . aplukênu ša Ašurdān, "The great prince . . . . true son of Ashurdān," *Tig.* VII, 49; bilat eklim ša šanātim ša<sup>1</sup> innadû, "The field's produce of the years in which<sup>1</sup> it lies fallow"; burāša ša<sup>2</sup> ša ḳarêti, "cypress for beams." The defined noun may follow ša and its genitive, in which case the genitive is repeated by a suffix: ša Eurmeiminanki . . . . rêša-ša, "of Eurmeiminanki . . . . its head," i.e., the head of Eurmeiminanki, VAB, IV, 128, 67-70.
4. Replaces construct relation between a noun (or its equivalent) and a phrase. Here the relative again represents as a demon-

<sup>1</sup> Or "while"; ša is here a temporal conjunctive adverb.

<sup>2</sup> The noun is written with an ideogram [giš-]li and the construction is probably accusative. Craig, *RT*, 25, 25; see the writer's *Tammuz and Ishtar*, p. 137.

strative the noun (or its equivalent) which precedes and assumes a sense (nominative, accusative, genitive, dative) imposed by the nature of the verbal clause. Since *ša* is wholly indeclinable and without indication of number, it is usually defined for the dative, often for the accusative, and always for the genitive relation, by a supplementary pronoun suffixed to one of the elements of the phrase.<sup>1</sup>

- (a) Nominative. <sup>11u</sup>Šušinak ili piristišun ša ašbu ina puzrāti, "The god Š, god of their counsel, who abides in secrecy," V R. 6, 31.
- (b) Accusative. rubû šîru ša . . . . ana biblat lib-bišu ittarru-šu-ma, "The far-famed prince whom . . . . they brought unto the desire of his heart," *Tig.* VII, 38. Hammurapi, ša <sup>11u</sup>Sin ibniu-šu, "whom the god Sin created," Code, II, 14. More often without accusative suffix after the verb; awātim ša ina narê-ia ašturu, "the words which I have written on my stela," Code, Rev. XXV, 79.<sup>2</sup>
- (c) Genitive. Hammurapi, ša kima šamê u eršitim išdā-ša šuršudā, "whose foundations have been laid fast even as the heavens and the earth," Code I, 22-25; Du-azag . . . . ša . . . . ilāni . . . . irammû kiribšu, "wherein the gods dwell." Three men, ša maḥri-šunu . . . . amtam ana <sup>11u</sup>Šamaš-šulûli ipḫidu, "before whom she intrusted a slave girl to Shamash-šululi," *VAB*, VI, No. 70, 5-10.
- (d) Dative. A field, ša innadnu-šum, "which is given to him," Code, § 62, 35; ziti . . . . ša Iziāšar idinu-ši-im, "The portion . . . . which Izi-ashar gave her," *VAB*, VI, No. 15, 12-13; "Nebuchadrezzar, ša <sup>11u</sup>Šamaš kināti iddinu-uš, to whom Shamash granted faithfulness."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I do not at present know of any examples of the nominative sense, or *ša* as subject, explained by a supplementary demonstrative. In noun phrases where *ša* is necessarily a subject no supplementary demonstrative is used; bit Ebarrim ša ki šubat šamai, "The temple Ebarru which is like the abode of heaven," Code, II, 31.

<sup>2</sup> See also Kraetzschmar, *BA*, I, 403.

<sup>3</sup> kināti, plural of kittu? or kinūtu, family? Cf. Radau, *BE*, 17, 24, 6, and Thompson, *Reports*, 90, Rev. 13—uncertain.



## B. šat.

1. Demonstrative. Not known.
2. "The one of," "man of." Often in feminine names of the First Dynasty. Ša-at-<sup>ilat</sup>Aja, Thureau-Dangin, *Lettres et contrats*, p. 46; Ša-at-<sup>ilu</sup>Šamaš, *ibid.*, 47; see also Ranke, *Personal Names*, p. 194.<sup>1</sup> Often in the expression šāt mūši, "The of the night," "the night time,"<sup>2</sup> in a ša-at mūši, "in the night time."
- 3, 4. šāt has not yet been found in the constructions entered under ša 3, 4.

## C. šū.

1. Demonstrative. Since this šū was obtained by changing a proto-Semitic demonstrative še\* to conform to the personal pronoun šū, already used as in this sense, this form lost its demonstrative force and was employed as a relative only.
2. In the sense "one of," etc. The survival of this meaning depends upon the interpretation of proper names beginning ŠU-<sup>ilu</sup>X, as ŠU-<sup>ilu</sup>Sin,<sup>3</sup> ŠU-<sup>ilu</sup>Dumuzi,<sup>4</sup> ŠU-<sup>ilat</sup>MAH,<sup>5</sup> ŠU-<sup>ilu</sup>Nabium,<sup>6</sup> ŠU-<sup>ilu</sup>Da-[gan],<sup>7</sup> ŠU-ili-šu,<sup>8</sup> with which cf. Ša-ili-šu above. These names have been read Gimil-<sup>ilu</sup>X. Delitzsch, *BA*, II, 625, and

<sup>1</sup> It was this fact that probably led Ranke, p. 245, n. 9, to regard šāt as a feminine of ša. Since, "She of Aja," "She of Shamash," is expressed by šāt, whereas "He of <sup>ilu</sup>Amurru" is expressed by Ša-<sup>ilu</sup>Amurrim, and since this distinction occurs regularly, the natural inference is that ša is masculine and šāt feminine. In these names šāt is apparently regarded as feminine, but only because of its mistaken resemblance to the construct feminine ending at. If it really were the feminine singular, then šūt should be the feminine singular of šū. Masculine names with šāt will probably occur as we progress in our studies. Note above, ša 2, that ša is both masculine and feminine.

<sup>2</sup> This construction has never been successfully explained. šāt has been generally explained as the construct of a word šattu, "duration." The Sumerian for ina šāt mūši is *gig-ù-na*, IV R. 26a, 19; *SBH*, 122, Rev. 5, etc. See Meissner, *SAI*, 6718. Note also *ud-ù-ne*=ina šāt ūmi, "in the day time," Gudea, Cyl. A, 8, 2. ù is the Sumerian for "anything," and *na, ne* is here probably the demonstrative pronoun, rendered in Semitic by šū, annū. *ù-na, ù-ne*, "this or the anything." Such I venture to suggest is the Sumerian translation of this phrase.

<sup>3</sup> Name of the fourth king of the dynasty of Ur. Not otherwise found as the name of a person.

<sup>4</sup> Thureau-Dangin, *Lettres et contrats*, p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, and Ranke, *Personal Names*, p. 84.

<sup>7</sup> Ranke, *BE*, 6, 6, 3. Schorr, *VAB*, VI, 301, reads Da-mu.

<sup>8</sup> Ranke, *Personal Names*, p. 84.

Tallquist, *Neubabylonisches Namenbuch*, pp. 311ff., have proven that šu interchanges with gimil, gimillu in the same name. Ranke, however, in his *Personal Names*, p. 246, suggested that perhaps in certain of these cases šu is the relative particle. I am inclined to think that gimil is the true reading for most of these names. ŠU=gimillu, "sparing, mercy," is not only documented by ŠU=gimillu in II R. 39c 40, but *K-šu-A* (i.e., ŠU- strengthened by the element *dug*), with the Sumerian values *šub* and *mu*, has the meanings *ikribu*, "reverence," "prayer," *karābu*, "show favor,"<sup>1</sup> and in proper names *K-šu-A* + ŠA has the meaning *gimillu*, *gamālu*. Cf. *Iluni-ga-mil*, VS, VIII, 26, 3, with *Illum-K-šu-A* + ŠA, 102, 2. On the other hand the comparison of šu-ili-šu with ša-ili-šu certainly points to the use of šu in the sense, "man of," "one of."

3. Replaces the construct relation. This appears to be clear in the following cases: *arad šu*<sup>11u</sup> *Immer*, "Servant of the god Immer," *Collection De Clercq*, p. 153, compared with *arad ša*<sup>11u</sup> *Immer*, *ibid.*, p. 208; *arad šu*<sup>11at</sup> *Innini*, "Servant of the goddess Innini," *ibid.*, p. 108.
4. Relative before phrases. *šu i-ki-šu napšatam ana (âl) Maš-kanšabrim (ki)*, "who granted life unto the city M," Code, IV, 1; cf. also IV, 9 and 29. In each case an antecedent, viz., Hammurapi, is understood.

#### D. šūt.<sup>2</sup>

1. Demonstrative force. *ilāni šu-ut*<sup>11u</sup> *Anunnaki*, "The gods, the Anunnaki,"<sup>3</sup> Deluge, 125.
2. "Man of," "one of," "he-she-it of."<sup>4</sup> *šu-ut tamhara*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *PSBA*, 1911, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> Muss-Arnolt incorrectly entered this word in his *Dictionary*, p. 1091, as *šupar*. The derivations cited on p. 1092 are to be regarded as superseded.

<sup>3</sup> Such appears to be the construction, or under 2, "The gods, the of the Anunnaki"; in any case not a preposition. Dhorme, *Choix*, p. 112, misunderstood the construction which Jensen, *KB*, VI, 239, had already rendered correctly.

<sup>4</sup> This force of *šu-ut* is entered in the lexicons as a preposition. The true meaning of this construction in the case of *ša* was likewise misunderstood by Kraetzschmar, *BA*, I, 395, where he regards *ša* as a preposition.

<sup>5</sup> *Creat.*, I, 131, *tamharu*, but II, 37, better *tamhara*, or III, 41, *tamhari*. In this construction the noun is really a genitive, as in Arabic after *و*, but the Babylonians often treated the whole as a compound noun, hence the accusative after *ipkid* in II, 37, or *šu-ut tamharata*, variant in I, 131.

. . . . ipkid-ma, "The of battle she entrusted (into his hands)"; a-na . . . . šu-ut ma-ḥa-zi ša<sup>mat</sup> Akkadī-(ki), "to . . . . them of the cities of Akkad," *BA*, II, 262, 13; šu-ut a-di e-mu-ki-šu, "The according to its strength," i.e., "as much as the land of Zikiti can send," Harper, *Letters*, 515, Rev. 1; šu-ut miriḥti annīti ša Teumman iḳbu amḥur šaḳūti<sup>ilat</sup> Ištar, "As for the (of) insolence, this, which T. uttered, I appealed to the lofty Ishtar," *K*, 1796, 11 in Winckler, *Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten*, III, 71; šu-ut im-ra-šu-nu ikulu, "(the horses) will eat (the of) their fodder," *II R.* 48a, 33.<sup>1</sup> This particle seems to be employed in this sense usually in a neuter signification. "He-of" is rare except in the name of the official [commonly read (amelu) šu-par-šak] (amel) šu-ut-rêsi; at least šu-ut ri-e-ši in *CT*, 23, 10, 14, obviously contains this element, "He of the head," a term for eunuch. See Jensen, *ZA*, 24, 109. A personal sense in Ištar . . . . šu-ut sibit aḥê, "she of the seven brothers," Craig, *RT*, 55, 5; <sup>ilat</sup>Nintud šu-ut<sup>ilat</sup> Maḥ, "Nintud, the Maḥ."<sup>2</sup>

3. To replace the construct relation. ḳaḳḳabāni šu-ut<sup>ilu</sup> Enlil, "The stars of Enlil," *CT*, 33, 2, 36; bēlum ilāni šu-ut dadmê, "lord of the gods of habitations," Craig, *RT*, I, 43, 18 = King, *Creation*, I, 206; nišê tu'ami šu-ut 4610 bilti maltakti erî namri, "Twin lions of 4610 talents *in weight* of polished bronze," Winckler, *Sargon*, 30, 162. All the known examples under this heading have a masculine plural before šu-ut which probably led scholars to regard šu-ut as a plural. The lack of examples of singular and feminine nouns in this position is probably accidental.

<sup>1</sup> Note the accusative here; see n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *CT*, 17, 42, 13. Here šu-ut has the same grammatical signification as ša above under 2, end. Probably here or under (a), *Babylonian Chronicle*, III, 1, \*ilāni-ša šu-ut Uruk, "Its gods the ones of Erech." This construction may be parallel to the redundant method of expressing the genitive, abi-šu ša X, "his father the of X," *passim* in Neobabylonian contracts; ina šipri-šu ša<sup>ilu</sup> Ea, "By his commission<sup>†</sup> the of Ea," *VAB*, IV, 62, 14.

#### 4. š ū t.

Replaces construct relation between a noun and a verbal clause.

- (a) Subject. "Among the gods her first born šu-ut iš-ku-nu-ši puḥri, who made for her an assembly," *Creat.*, I, 127; II, 33; III, 37, 95; šu-ut napišti šakna, "whatsoever (things) are created with the breath of life (thou sheperdest)," Gray, *Shamash*, p. 12, 25; "(As for them) šu-ut lumna ipušu zēr-šunu . . . . who have done evil their seed . . . .," *ibid.*, 18, 12; mātātī . . . . šu-ut ikkanša, "the lands . . . . which humble themselves," *ibid.*, 20, 51.
- (b) Object. mātātī šu-ut šu-un-na-a li-ša-nu, "the lands which tongue(s) rehearse" Gray, *Shamash*, p. 14, 49.
- (c) Genitive. šu-ut ulla pî-šu-nu ša-kin, "(As for them) whose mouths institute denial," Gray, *Shamash*, p. 18, 13.